

(i)

Mississippi Lime - SDs & Jefferson County

5/22/14 - Roger Walker, Tom Seidhoff, Ken Hagg, Leanne Tippett Mosby, Kym-Moor, Wendy Cirt
↓
Ray Forum consultants for Ray Forum
Josh Tapp, Lamy Gonzales, Amy Bresania

Kyne - Mott St. Monitor - designed to be source oriented monitor for DR - ~~not a general one~~ at highest concentration
- unique circumstances - decline in H's @ monitor - guidance contemplates unique circumstances

- resources, technical, public health perspective - better to evaluate @ Phase 2 rather than evaluate monitor that will be in afterwards

→ Four point standard - May 22, 2014 "check w/ EPA Region VII"

Ken Hagg - analyzed old monitors @ City Hall switched to Mott St - essentially co-located
Lined they touched each other well - so analyzed the H St supplemented w/
City Hall "Mott St. +"

- apparently - Doe Run still operates monitor @ City Hall - this used to supplement data for "Mott St. +"

- every monitor recorded values above std - but were Jan. 1st - clean - not even DR monitors

(EPA wants data - DR will have to request DR permission)

Josh - why Mott St. monitor located there not split for lead or SO₂ or both?
"MDNR will check"

- Graph showing sources - interesting that the major sources are all in a line along the river sand channel - will make DR difficult

Tom - want to know if alternate area SIP that only includes DR CD is clean data (although not 3 yrs) to show that monitor has been addressed, particularly considering Phase II, which will catch any significant source

(2)

- josh - model receptors could need to be replaced across NA, not just at the monitor - play for an os strategy vs to focus on receptors @ monitor and wait for future plays to look @ other sources

- josh - what happens in Phase II if we have a new modified NA boundary that overlaps NA boundary we just redesignated attainment?

- when you look @ attainment due to sources within 50 km of boundary - would we be setting precedent where we aren't looking @ contribution to NA, not just monitor?

Ton - Pickington vs. West sources in NA would be evaluated in three rounds (Ex - Rush Island?)

Josh - worried about unintended consequences - that sources would never be evaluated

Ton - don't want to go through two rounds of controls (ex - for this NA, then Phase II)

- josh - what if except from Round 2 due to controls for this NA?

Ton - didn't think we would be looking @ this far (km out) - thought Phase 2 would happen - so would be able to take longer to plan for control strategy - rather than a number of months

Option 1 - all sources around NA picked up

Option 2 - MIE drops out

- MoNR - intend for Rush Island to be analyzed - we would be explicit in their SIP - state would commit to take them through Phase I

- one source @ Hanning border modeling except for Rush Island, then move
↳ hand on actual conditions right now

- josh - needs to know who will split for SDx

- Leanne - what would be to put language in SIP that Rush Island will be evaluated in Phase II - but still have to think about how to do this

9/22/14

Disc. w/ MONR

(3)

Wendy - Questions about DOJ settlement - will it change? what about intervenors?

V.I.T. Public comment on Rule that would result from this CO?

- look @ what procedure could be

key point - keeping Rush Island on the list. They know they

have to do something w/ all 3 plants - struggling w/

Rush Island due to geography (small plant, small footprint)